

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

**M.1 PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITY**

(a) The standards and procedures for determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible are set forth in FAR Subpart 9.1. Deficiencies concerning the general standards of prospective contractor responsibility at FAR 9.104-1, and any special standards established for this procurement under FAR 9.104-2, may be serious enough to result in a determination of non-responsibility. As with all aspects of prospective contractor responsibility, a finding of non-responsibility can be made at any time prior to contract award. However, even if such deficiencies are not so serious to result in such a determination, they will nonetheless be considered in the evaluation as conducted under the evaluation factors set forth in this solicitation.

(b) The following special standards of responsibility have been established for this procurement: NONE

(End of text)

**M.2 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS -- GENERAL**

**1. Source Selection**

This competitive negotiated acquisition shall be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection", and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, same subject. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, "NASA formal source selection" will apply.

The attention of Offerors is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, "Proposal evaluation" and to NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of unacceptable proposals".

A trade-off process, as described at FAR 15.101-1, will be used in making source selection.

**2. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors**

The evaluation factors are Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. These factors, as described at NFS 1815.304-70, will be used to evaluate each proposal. This Section M provides a further description for each evaluation factor, inclusive of sub-factors. Only the Mission Suitability Factor is numerically scored.

**3. Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors**

The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Cost Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor.

(End of provision)

**M.3 MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION FACTOR**

The Mission Suitability Evaluation will take into consideration whether the resources proposed are consistent with the proposed efforts and accomplishments associated with each subfactor or whether they are overstated or understated for the effort to be accomplished as described by the Offeror and evaluated by NASA. The

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

Offeror's justification for the proposed resources will be considered in this evaluation. If the Offeror's proposal demonstrates a lack of resource realism, it will be evaluated as demonstrating a lack of technical understanding of commitment to the requirements. In addition to any probable cost adjustment, the Government may assign stand-alone technical mission suitability findings based on programmatic risks inherent in their cost proposals. In addition, if the Offeror's proposal demonstrates a lack of relevant risk identification along with appropriate mitigation strategies and justifications, it will also be evaluated as demonstrating a lack of technical understanding or commitment to the unique requirements.

**1. Mission Suitability Subfactors and Description of Each Subfactor**

**Subfactor A – Technical Approach**

The Offeror's written TPs responding to each of the two RTOs included as Enclosure 1 of the RFP will be evaluated to ensure that they reflect a clear understanding of each of the RTO's objectives, and to ensure that the offeror maintains a comprehensive understanding of the task objectives. The TPs will also be evaluated to ensure that the Offeror has accurately and effectively identified the appropriate elements of the SOW required to fulfill the specific requirements of each RTO.

The technical approach, labor categories, projected hours, Government interface, flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information in the written TPs will be evaluated to ensure that the TPs reflect an effective, realistic and efficient approach to accomplishing the RTO. The offeror's approach to identifying the optimum skill mix based upon the requirements of each of the individual RTOs, as well as the offeror's approach for matching skill mix to services/functions, will be evaluated for efficiency and effectiveness. The offeror's techniques and procedures for satisfying each RTO requirement will be evaluated for timeliness and effectiveness.

The task objectives, potential technical problems, risks, crucial issues, and any other anticipated problems – as well as subsequent mitigation/resolutions for any risks, problems or issues – will be evaluated to ensure that the offeror has efficiently, thoroughly and effectively identified those risks, problems and/or issues, and has offered reasonable, effective and efficient solutions for mitigating or solving those risks, problems and/or issues. The offeror's identification of the most significant potential risks under each of the RTOs and its risk management approach used to manage those significant potential risks will be evaluated to ensure that the rationale supporting the prioritization of those risks is reasonable and effective.

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's ability to comply with the higher-level contract requirement by specified in clause E.2.

The Government will evaluate any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies that are proposed by the Offeror for efficiency (tangible and intangible) and overall benefit to the Government at the contract level. The Government will evaluate the proposed method, technique or technology for impact on performance, to ensure compliance and effectiveness. The Government will also evaluate whether efficiencies are quantified, where possible. The Offeror may receive credit for the proposed innovations only to the extent of its description

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

in Attachment M, as explained in its Mission Suitability proposal. Inconsistent statements about any innovations in the proposal may result in a neutral or negative evaluation by the Government. Any innovation may result in a positive, neutral, or negative evaluation in spite of the Government's right to waive an innovation during contract period under clause H.17, Contractor Proposed Innovations, of the contract.

**Subfactor B – Management Approach**

The Government will evaluate the interrelationships of technical, business and subcontract management for adequacy and reasonableness in meeting the requirements of this contract. The Government will evaluate all interfaces with NASA personnel for adequacy and effectiveness. The organizational chart which identifies where this contract fits in the corporate structure will be evaluated for clarity and effectiveness. The Government will evaluate an additional organizational chart which identifies managerial positions by title for effectiveness and clarity.

The Government will evaluate the detailed description of the responsibilities and authorities for management of this contract, from lower levels through intermediate management to top-level management for adequacy and completeness. The Government will evaluate elements to include span of control, degree of autonomy and lines of communication for overall adequacy and responsiveness in performing work effectively on this contract. The Government will also evaluate the processes for resolving priority conflicts for resources (the ability to effectively manage resource priorities) and /functions (the ability to provide expertise in multi-discipline areas of the SOW simultaneously) within the organization for adequacy and effectiveness in meeting contract requirements. All interfaces with GSFC personnel and subcontractors will be evaluated for clarity, adequacy and effectiveness.

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, timeliness, efficiency and/or clarity of: 1) the subcontractor's proposed interfaces to the prime offeror's organizational structure; 2) the basis for selection of each subcontractor; 3) the nature and extent of the work distribution to be performed by the subcontractor; 4) benefits to the Government derived from the subcontracting arrangement to the Government; and 5) methods of management and reporting to GSFC of subcontractor's financial and technical plans and performance. The offeror's plans for addressing problems that arise as a result of poor and/or non-performance of subcontracted portions of the contract will be evaluated for efficiency and effectiveness, and to ensure that its plan reflect a responsive approach to addressing issues or concerns. The functional split between the responsibilities of the prime and subcontractor(s) will be evaluated for effectiveness and to ensure the proposed distribution of work will result in an efficient integrated team.

The Government will evaluate elements of the Offerors responsibilities and authorities for management of this contract for effectiveness and adequacy that include the selection of the Offeror's Program Manager position to include the degree of corporate autonomy, process for controlling essential resources/functions necessary to accomplish the work and ability to utilize and redirect subcontract resources. The Government will evaluate the type and degree of corporate support and resources under the direct control of the Program Manager for effectiveness and quality responsiveness in meeting the requirement. The Government will evaluate the process

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

followed in obtaining decisions beyond his/her authority in resolving priority conflicts for resources (the ability to effectively manage resource priorities) and functions (the ability to provide expertise in multi-discipline areas of the SOW simultaneously) not under the Program Manager's direct control for reasonableness, efficiency and responsiveness to meeting contract requirements.

The Offeror's identified critical positions and the associated rationale for selection will be evaluated for understanding and effectiveness. In addition, identified qualifications, span of control, and authority to manage and redirect resources/subcontracts for each critical position will be evaluated for efficiency. The approach to utilize critical positions, proposed usage and contingency plans for replacement of critical personnel will be evaluated for effectiveness and risk management.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's phase-in approach for continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent Contractor during the 30-day phase-in period including the efficiency of the Offeror's plans for timely processing of the Personal Identity Verification (PIV) requirements. The Government will evaluate how the phase-in plan clearly demonstrates an ability to assume full contract responsibility by the end of the phase-in period. The Government will evaluate how the phase-in plan specifically addresses strategy for maintaining ongoing work, the proposed management organization, schedule, staffing plan, orientation and training of personnel. If proposed, the Government will evaluate for reasonableness, any assumptions or dependencies on the incumbent contractor. The Government will also evaluate the extent of involvement of NASA personnel during the 30-day phase-in period.

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror's Safety and Health Plan to ensure that supplies and services are furnished in a safe and healthful manner, and that the Offeror develops, produces, and/or delivers products to NASA that will be safe and successful for their intended use.

The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for compliance with applicable Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as compliance with NPR 8715.3, NFS 1852.223-73 and applicable NASA Agency-wide and Installation specific policies and/or procedures including the effectiveness of protection of life, health, and well-being of NASA and Contractor employees, property and equipment. Further, the Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated to determine the effectiveness of protection for subcontractor employees for any proposed subcontract. The Offeror's plan for handling hazardous materials identified in the Section I, "Hazardous Material Identification and Material Safety Data" (FAR 52.223-3 Alternate I) clause will be evaluated for compliance and responsiveness.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's expertise and/or tools presented in understanding and managing multiple task orders for contracts of this magnitude in an efficient and timely manner. The Government will evaluate the detailed plan presented for organizing, assigning, staffing and managing task orders from initiation to completion to include configuration control, subcontracting, schedule and cost for accuracy, reasonableness and efficiency. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to managing workload variability/surge requirements and any proposed efficiencies for reasonableness and technical understanding. The Government will evaluate the methods described for management of manpower fluctuations, day to day requirements and utilization of efficient techniques for technical merit and effectiveness.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's total compensation plan including fringe benefits in accordance with FAR 52.222-46, "Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees, to determine if it reflects a sound management approach and understanding of the contract requirements. The total compensation plan will be evaluated for the Offeror's ability to provide uninterrupted high-quality work. The total compensation plan proposed will be evaluated for its expected impact on recruiting and retention, its realism, and its consistency with a total plan for compensation. The comprehensive hiring plan will also be evaluated for realism of the proposed. Because of the possible effect on the Offeror's ability to retain a competent workforce, a total compensation plan that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various labor categories, may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

**2. Evaluation of Deviations/Exceptions**

Any proposed deviations from or exceptions to requirements or terms and conditions expressed in this Draft RFP will be evaluated for their expected impact (both positive and negative) upon successful performance. The validity of the proposed rationale supporting any such deviations/exceptions will be evaluated.

**3. Weights and Scoring**

In accordance with NFS 1815.304-70(b)(1), the Mission Suitability Factor will be weighted and scored on a 1000 point scale.

The weights (points) associated with each Mission Suitability subfactors are as follows:

Subfactor A: Technical Approach	500
Subfactor B: Management Approach	<u>500</u>
	1,000

The Mission Suitability subfactors will be evaluated using the adjectival rating, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for each subfactor will be multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. For example, if a subfactor has possible 200 points and receives a percent rating 80, then the score for that subfactor would be 160 points.

The Mission Suitability evaluation will include the results of any cost realism analysis. The realism of proposed costs may significantly affect the Offeror's Mission Suitability score.

**4. Evaluation Findings**

The Government will evaluate Mission Suitability by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the following:

Weakness – a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance or demonstrates a lack of safety awareness

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

Significant Weakness – a proposal flaw that appreciably increases safety risk or the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

Deficiency – a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the safety risk or risk of unsuccessful contract performance or to an unacceptable level

Significant Strength – a proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government

Strength – a proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.)

(End of provision)

#### **M.5 COST EVALUATION FACTOR**

The proposed costs of the Representative Task Orders (RTO's) and the rates proposed in Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fixed Fee Matrices, will be assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C).

Offerors should refer to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of "cost realism" and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "cost realism analysis" and "probable cost".

Both the "proposed and probable cost" will reflect the Offeror's proposed fee amount. Any proposed fee is not adjusted in the probable cost assessment. The total FFP Phase-In price and the proposed and the total probable RTO costs will be presented to the Source Selection Authority as well as any cost risk associated with the proposal.

(End of provision)

#### **M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012)**

An offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on FAR Part 15 and the evaluation criteria in this provision. All past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated.

For purposes of past performance, the term "offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors shall also be evaluated and attributed to the offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

A “recent” contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 5 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 5 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A “relevant” contract depends on the size and content of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least \$1.2M. A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1.2M. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance – i.e., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size and content. Content is more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The term “content” means the type and complexity of services, work, or supplies, in comparison to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

An offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of “recent” and “relevant” past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a “Neutral” rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.

The Government will consider an offeror’s explanation of any problems encountered on any identified contracts, and any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

The overall confidence rating assigned to an offeror’s Past Performance (see below) will reflect a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the oral presentation, if applicable; written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information.

Past Performance Ratings – The level of confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component as discussed above. As used in the ratings below, the term “pertinent” is equivalent to the term “relevant.” The following adjectival rating guidelines will be used when subjectively assessing both components.

Very High Level of Confidence

The Offeror’s relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror’s performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence

The Offeror’s relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror’s performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence

The Offeror’s relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror’s performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror’s relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror’s performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror’s existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.



SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD  
NNG13374674R

Very Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(End of provision)